

John Leake; The Demoniac Rituals to Replicate God and Mankind's New Religion of Science



John Leake, Tucker Carlson

John Leake; The Demonic Rituals to Replicate God and Mankind's New Religion of Science-Tucker Carlson



<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3PQpQ0MtHF0> 120m 12-8-2025

<https://rumble.com/v73kmfi> 96m 12-28-2025

John Leake studied history and philosophy with Sir Roger Scruton at Boston University. He then went to Vienna, Austria on a graduate school scholarship and ended up living in the city for over a decade, working as a freelance writer and translator. He has written investigative true crime books.

In March 2020, when SARS-CoV-2 started to spread in the United States, he perceived that the pandemic response was illogical at best, and possibly criminal. He found it especially suspicious how quickly public health officials dismissed repurposed medications such as hydroxychloroquine and ivermectin. In November of 2020, he watched a video of Dr. Peter McCullough's U.S. Senate testimony about early treatment. He sensed from this performance that Dr. McCullough was likely to lead the way in developing a more rational, honest, and humane response to the crisis. He made contact with McCullough in Dallas, Texas, where both authors live, and together they wrote "[The Courage to Face COVID-19: Preventing Hospitalization and Death](#)" He has a forthcoming title "Mind Viruses" that is expected in May.

Dr. Peter McCullough's sworn congressional testimony so outraged other doctors that were telling patients the party line that he had his license revoked as a disinformant. He has a lot to say about what constitutes "truth" in medicine. He also coauthored a second more recent book "[Vaccines: Mythology, Ideology, and Reality](#)" in 2025 with Dr. McCullough. You won't find any outright discussion of many critical angles earlier

revealed by RFK Jr. in this interview or of the fate of whistleblowers like Judy Mikovits, but beware of the nightmare of never being able to believe your MD again. This is dangerous reading! *Caveat Lector*, more pieces to a chaotic puzzle. Gracious souls may pray for the billions maimed and killed, the ungracious may have something else in mind, read at your own risk. The evidentiary premeditated transcripts are now public. The teamwork of Peter and John have worked wonders.

Chapters:

0:00 The Vaccine Hesitation Heresy

8:11 The Bribing of Churches to Promote the Covid Vaccine

14:20 The Religious Annunciation of the Vaccine

21:03 Vaccine Worship

33:58 Why Do Vaccine Developers Have Legal Immunity?

39:26 Tyrannical Humiliation Rituals

45:49 The Demonic Forces at Work in the Medical Industry

1:07:25 Lucifer, Pride, and Tribalism

1:25:44 Man's Attempt to Replicate the Language of God

1:31:46 Are We Changing People's Genetic Code?

1:48:46 The Original War on Handwashing

1:56:00 The Cancer Coverup of the 1950s

TUCKER: All through the COVID experience, tragedy, I had this kind of recurring question of my mind, which no one's ever answered. And I think that you have gotten to the answer or close to the answer. And the question is this, why were public health authorities in the United States and acting in concert with the media so intent on discouraging Americans from treating COVID? There was this persistent and very aggressive and sometimes really vicious campaign to get people to stop thinking about how to treat this illness, which we were told was going to wipe out a huge percentage of humanity and just to accept the Vax. But no treatment at all because that's fish tank cleaner, it's horse tranquilizer. What was that?

JOHN: Well, the short answer is that it was to stamp out the heresy of what is called vaccine hesitation. The vaccine hesitation, there's a huge literature on it. It's a psychological analysis of all of the factors

that would cause anyone, a man, a woman, a young person to hesitate to get the vaccine. And I want to emphasize this, you Google vaccine hesitancy, you're going to get a million search results. So what is vaccine hesitancy? And I think it's best understood not so much in scientific terms, not in empirical scientific terms, it's a form of heresy.

And this was the thing that my co-author, Dr. Peter McCullough and I, we had conversations about this for the last five years.

Why is it heresy? And conversely, why is the vaccine a kind of, in the minds of so many people, something like a savior? Well, a liberator and a savior. And I hope I'm not out of line by showing you this on the cover of the book. I know this kind of sounds like a plugging the book, but there's a reason for this. That, do you know what that is? I don't. That is a 20 euro silver coin issued by the Vatican in the year 2022, commemorating the COVID-19 vaccine, specifically the messenger RNA vaccine. Actually? And you will observe the traditional Catholic iconography, the three, the Trinity, you could, you could go into, for example, the, the art history museum in Vienna. There's a Raphael painting Madonna of the Meadow and it's this tripartite figures. I think in Madonna and the Meadow, it's the Virgin Mary, Christ and John the Baptist. So that three, and then here you have the cross. When somebody looks at that, particularly if they're Roman Catholic, they immediately have all of the iconography and all the feelings and thoughts.

TUCKER: That's the most resonant image possible. For sure.

JOHN: So if you look at the new mystic catalog, the coin catalog for the Vatican, it issues different metals and coins and so forth. It is described as "A boy prepares to receive the vaccine".

TUCKER: This is his first vaccine.

JOHN: You got it. Yes. I mean, the grammar, the number of words, it's identical. A boy prepares to receive the Eucharist. So what Francis did with this, and I don't know if he's the guy making the decisions, is let's take the existing religious iconography, the idea of Christ, the Savior, the one that will protect you or at least your soul. How are we supposed to interpret this other than what's the vaccine that's the Savior? So I saw that and I thought, well, that's rather

remarkable. I wonder if there are any other indications of this overlaying vaccine iconography on top of existing religious iconography. And I just started finding them everywhere.

TUCKER: Really? Well, there's that famous, not famous enough, but still famous Diego Rivera mural that I believe hangs into Troy pain in the 30s, which presents the vaccine as a kind of Eucharist.

JOHN: Right. And that iteration, I think that's a funny painting, by the way. I'm glad that you mentioned that. And that iteration, it would seem that the central figure is the Virgin Mary. She has the sort of Christ child like in a manger. These different animals around the manger like the Nativity. What he's actually doing with that is the different animals around the Nativity. See, there's a horse, there's a cow, I think there's a goat. That's in the way it's described is a reference to the serum that back in those days, I think this is in the 30s. Yes. That's a reference to the serum that is, for example, extracted from horses with diphtheria.

The cow is obviously smallpox. So it's taking the Nativity scene and it's making it a celebration of this great human achievement. But they're everywhere. So really, this kind of iconography, I mean, it's a big world and there's a lot of images obviously. But we found a church in South Africa. And I think it's a Roman Catholic church. It might be in a church of England, but I think it's a, I should remember this, but there's a huge banner hanging from the facade that said, even the blood of Christ cannot protect you, get vaccinated. And what's interesting about this, it shows for real.

TUCKER: Speaking of heresy.

JOHN: And it, the subliminal quality of this piece of propaganda is remarkable because blood, it's all black, black script, except for the word blood, it's blood red. And then the word vaccine, the script is in blood red. So you see the equivalents, but it's not really an equivalence. It's the association of equivalents, but in fact, the vaccine is more effective than the blood of Christ in protecting the beneficiary. So what is this?

TUCKER: This is shocking. I didn't know any of this.

JOHN: Yes. If you want to understand how vaccines work in theory and in practice, it is to induce the body's immune system or stimulate

the body's immune system to respond to an invading microorganism. So there's no better vaccine than actually getting through the illness. Why do we have vaccines? The, the thought going back to Jenner is there are diseases which are extremely dangerous, which could cause horrible disease and mortality. The idea of a vaccine is induce natural immunity without putting the recipient through the trials and the danger and possible death that he would experience if he just got the bug.

Okay. Does that make sense? Of course it does. So this proclamation, vaccine immunity for COVID-19, it's better than natural immunity. That is *prima facie*, totally preposterous and absurd. No one that's ever spent any time studying immunology would believe that for one second. No epidemiologist could believe that? No immunologist. Well, how could you? I mean, it just on the face of it is totally preposterous, but this is what we were told. Very interesting because I immediately perceive this just from reading a textbook of immunology. So I knew this was, on the face of it, insane. It's only been in the last few weeks. I mean, the last few weeks here we are kind of getting in 2025 2025 that Sanjay Gupta and Paul Offit, who's a very prominent vaccinologist, had made the rounds and said something that that really wasn't correct to smear natural immunity in the case of COVID-19. That technically wasn't true.

TUCKER: How could those men still have jobs in medicine? I don't know. That's to me, it's really these are social questions. It's questions about the system in which we live. How could you defend a system that allows that level of dishonesty and levies no penalty against people who promote lies? I just don't understand that.

JOHN: Because the factual truth of the matter is secondary, perhaps even tertiary. The secondary are perhaps even a distant third place to the orthodoxy, to maintaining the orthodoxy. And what I want to so I'm telling you this story. I mean, realizing this is something that came about through, I mean, we're now five years into this, years of reflection and conversation and debate with my co-author Dr. Peter McCullough.

And so the question is, could it be that we're constantly being told, follow the science?

Science is the thing that governs rational decision making. We're always being told that. But I think the big realization is most human affairs in decision making, it's actually not outside of something like Newtonian mechanics, like the weights and balances on an aircraft or engineering, a building, or all of the things in which mechanical forces can be measured and engineered in accordance with the force that's being exerted on it.

Apart from, let's keep it simple, Newtonian mechanics. There's so much in human existence, the way the body works, the mysteries of why do some people get sick? Why do some people don't? Why do some people live longer than others? All of these questions, we call it medical science, but in fact, it is so multi-factorial. There are so many different known and unknown factors at play that none of this can be measured. So what the medical mind has done is, I think perhaps without even being fully conscious of it, it's basically adopted orthodoxies, a doctrinal view of medicine. And if you look at the history-

TUCKER: Can I just ask you to pause? I hope that people watching this, if they didn't fully understand what you just said, we'll rewind it and listen to that again. That's the best explanation I've ever heard for what's gone wrong, what you just said right there.

JOHN: One starts with presuppositions, and then that's how you interpret the world. Your interpretive framework begins with your presuppositions, and that's how you actually view the world. Now, I come out, my formal training was in philosophy, and this was, I mean, I won't bore the audience with rehashing academic philosophical debate, but there was a very, very big debate in the 18th century between what philosophers called empiricism, the foremost representative of this was David Hume, and then rationalism, the foremost representative of being Descartes, René Descartes.

So Emmanuel Kant, this sort of unusually scholarly guy living in Koonigsberg, Germany, which back then was part of Prussia, it was actually a Hansa city, a free city in the Hansiotic league, very, very thoughtful contemplative guy. I mean, apparently that's kind of all he did was contemplate. When he came to the conclusion, which he

presented in a book called The Critique of Pure Reason, that in fact, it's a combination of both. In order to interpret the world, to make any sense of it at all, it's true that we have sensory data coming in, and you can pay attention to it and observe patterns, but you can't really interpret it unless you have certain categories that are already in your mind.

TUCKER: Exactly. This was our breakfast conversation this morning, and it has such effects on the way we live and understand things.

JOHN: It does. And so, we live in a world now in which I think an increasing number of Americans, of our citizenry, those who are awake and have some sense that paying attention, if they're paying attention, if they have been paying attention for the last few years, and COVID-19 is an interesting story because I think what happened with COVID-19, much of the fraud that was presented to us was so extreme and so crass that it sort of talked about reading David Hume. He said, it awakened to me from my dogmatic slumber. And I like that phrase. It's like, people began to think, our government is acting so weird, and people with any familiarity, for example, with immunology, I hope I can say something slightly vulgar, they're thinking, this is such colossal bullshit that, like, what is the government doing? What is this weird priesthood of vaccinologists telling us? It just can't be true.

So, I think that awakened a lot of people from their dogmatic slumber about our institutions. And now we're in this weird moment where a lot of American people have started to view the US government in a way that a wife with a philandering husband might start to view his representations. Like, she's caught him 10 times running around on her. He swears up and down that he's seen the light, that he tells the truth, that he's sworn off the girls. But at that point, even if he has sworn off the girls, the trust has been totally demolished. So we're in a weird, very unhappy moment right now. In which-

TUCKER: What well put? It's not unhappy.

JOHN: It's exactly right. In which we just don't believe anything that our institutions tell us. And I don't rejoice at that. I don't see how this republic is going to survive if we don't have some faith in our

institutions. I agree completely. But the question is, how can it be one back? Anyway, that's another question. So vaccines like other things that we've seen in medical history are now an object of orthodoxy. And you go to medical school, you read your textbooks, you tend your lectures, and you are told, this is the reality of this product, of this technology. And that's it.

It's axiomatic. There's no questioning it. There's no examining it. There's no critically evaluating it. There's no even going back just to ask, well, is it optimized? I mean, so a car manufacturer could say, well, it's axiomatic that a car has to have functioning brakes. And you say, well, are they optimized brakes? Are the materials, are the calipers, is all of that the best brakes that we could put on a car to make sure that a good reaction time, the driver's not drunk, if he hits the brakes, the car is going to stop. Are they the best brakes? Well, you can't ask that about vaccines. You can't say, well, some of these vaccines they go back to the 1930s when they were developed. Are they optimized? You can't even ask that.

So what is that telling us? The other thing is don't ask any questions and observe that since 1986, the vaccine manufacturers have received full liability immunity in the event that their products, injure or kill. And I think this vaccine ideology and religion that has been erected, it's a species of this just demoralizing anybody that asks questions. We're going to eliminate the inquisitive mind from the public.

TUCKER: And it's also, I agree with everything you're saying. And I think it's profound. It's not just on display during COVID. It's just like a feature of tyranny, always in everywhere. It's the basis of the novel in 1984. But I think it's also worth saying that when you participate in these humiliation rituals and when you go along with it, you change. There's something about you that dies. For sure. You're diminished and you hope it's not permanent, but it seems to be. But whatever, permanent or not, it's absolutely real. And people who went along with that are different people.

JOHN: Well this takes us to the big theme. So I did want to quickly mention Jokevich just to give you an even more luminous illustration of this. So he gets through COVID. It's PCR confirmed. He's fine.

The Australian authorities give him the green light. They say you can get on a plane and fly across the Pacific to Sydney to participate in the 2022 Australian Open. Okay. Well you know you've flown to Australia. I mean it's kind of, it's not exactly the most pleasant experience even if you're in first class. It's very long. It's so long. And you're going through all of these time zones and your internal clock is turned on its head. And I mean it's kind of a rough voyage. It's not what Captain Cook went through, but it's it kind of sucks.

So just consider the psychology of this. Your professional tennis player, you've been given the green light because your COVID recovered you can compete. And you had to go through a bunch of Hurley-Berley in order to get to that point. You get on the plane, you relax, you take a deep breath, you start thinking about your game. What are you going to do when you get to Sydney? You know, who are you competing against? And this is what's running through your mind. You then arrive in Sydney. You get off to clear passport control and customs and your pole decides and they say, you know something? We've decided to rescind that special dispensation to you. You're going to have... You're landing it here's... You're landing. You're going to have to go into quarantine.

So I don't see any way of characterizing this apart from sadism. That was a sadistic action. That was turning the screws on him. And then one of these people that participates in this, I remember one of the most revolted I've ever felt was this BBC reporter in the most condescending, smarmy, repugnant way, then does a struggle session interview with Chokovic.

BBC: Are you really going to stake your entire career? You could be the greatest ever. You could be the goat, Chokovic. Are you really prepared to set all of that aside just so you don't have to receive the vaccine?

TUCKER: Bow down before me and all of this will be yours. It's true.

JOHN: Well, there you go. All right. So you're seeing where this is headed. Yes.

TUCKER: I saw it then. Bow down before me and all of this will be yours.

TUCKER: This is totally the oldest offer there is.

JOHN: So I grew up in the Episcopal Church. I didn't really take religion seriously. No, it's not a serious religion.

TUCKER: I grew up in it too.

JOHN: I started getting interested in kind of as a scholarly the Hellenic Greek and which the Bibles read. I kind of came on it more from a philosophical approach. And the deeply religious concepts were something I hadn't spent a lot of time with. This contrasted me with Dr. McCulloch. He's a very religious person. And we're having dinner one night at his house and he says, John, how do you explain this? He said, I don't think. I mean, all these guys like money. Everybody likes money's fun, whatever. But I don't think money is sufficient to explain that. I agree completely. He said there must there must be something else.

TUCKER: Don't that this is the fabled red pill when you realize it's not really about bribery.

JOHN: I mean, that is heavy. Well, let's put it this way. If you trickle down the pyramid, I think a lot of your infantry, they're like, oh, money. You pay off the guards. Yes, it's fine. I could use that, you know. But you start getting to the top to the inner kind of presidium of this thing.

TUCKER: Are they bribing Bill Gates?

JOHN: Right. Exactly. Yes. So, but what is it? Like, like, what are we bumping up against? Exactly. And we can't quite see it. I mean, I remember.

TUCKER: I've been obsessed with this for five years. All this other stuff is just these are the symptoms of something very deep.

JOHN: It's true. So I am my first interview with Peter McCullough. Buddy Mine has a studio down, not too far from the hospital where he was at the time, vice president of internal medicine. Now he was on the way out, like they were about to scoot him out. No, actually he'd already lost his job as vice president of internal medicine at Baylor University. He then got a job at what was called Heartplace, which was happened to be on the Baylor campus but a different institution. He was about to lose his job at Heartplace. But at the moment he was still there as a cardiologist. And he came down to this little studio that belongs to a friend of mine. And we shot

this beautiful interview, the lighting, the camera, the audio. I mean, it was just absolute pro. And I removed myself from the interview. It's just like this Kiara Skiro lighting on Dr. McCullough. He's wearing a beautifully tailored suit. And he was just on it. I mean, every question cites all of the peer reviewed literature. You know, is totally circumspect in everything, every remark, every no speculation. Just the facts supported by the evidence cited. I put it on my YouTube channel and the studio, the guy that ran the studio, he had some friends in the independent media that helped to kind of get this thing going. I mean, he distributed the tape to the guys at the blaze, the guys at, I can't remember, a bunch of independent media podcasters and networks and stuff.

So this thing starts to go viral. And I'm thinking, well, this is great. I mean, he spoke very cautiously and he spoke very well. About four hours later, YouTube takes it down with no explanation. So I called Dr. McCullough and I said, we've just bumped into something that is really big and it's really dark. It's like a black hole. Like you, you know how you see a black hole in space? It's actually light is bending into it. You can't see it through an optical telescope, but what you can see is that the gravitation of the black hole is so strong that it's actually warping time space so that light is bending into it. I said, it's like we've just bumped into a black hole. We can't see it, but we know it's there. What the hell is it? And so this is actually what began the discussion. And ultimately, I don't see any other conclusion that's plausible. And I'm not saying this is the conclusion. I try and stay within the realm of physics and empirical observation. So I'll ask you, how else could you explain it other than what you just said a moment ago? This appears to be-

TUCKER: No, you go from physics to metaphysics the more you think about it, That's it.

JOHN: Well, that's what I told Peter. I said, I think we're going to have to leave the realm of physics and enter the realm of metaphysics, even though it's something I'm not comfortable doing.

TUCKER: Exactly how I think if you grew up An Episcopalian, like the one thing you don't want to talk about is the supernatural. You

just don't. It's true. It's de-emphasized. It's embarrassing. There's a kind of social stigma to it. You're handling snakes in your trailer park. I mean, there's just a whole suite of disincentives to even think about stuff like that. It's kind of interesting. I feel you on this, yes.

JOHN: So for those of your audience, this is what I was going to talk to, you're a step ahead of me. So, Aloysha, the youngest boy of the brothers, Karamazov. This is a scene within the novel. Right. Right. With his brother Ivan, who is the rational, imperialist, empiricist who is reading all these ideas out of France and Germany. I think it's probably around the year 1860. Exactly. So, Ivan says, I have a story for you. And I think it's kind of charming. I think it's kind of original. It has a certain flair. It's almost in a playful way.

He says, so, second coming of Christ, he drops down into Seville, Spain in the midst of the inquisition, the dark days of the inquisition. He's walking down the street around the old Seville Cathedral. He's sort of blessing people and groups are gathering around him and, oh my goodness, he's returned in Seville, Spain during the inquisition of all places. Certainly the grand inquisitor himself is drawn out of his office, goes down to the square in front of the cathedral and says, arrest that man. Arrest him. Arrest him. He's an imposter. So this is where it has such literary power. So the inquisitor puts Jesus in jail and he comes into the cell and he looks at him and he says, is it really you? And Jesus sort of looks at him and I think he just simply answers yes or nods.

INQUISITOR: It really is you. This is just remarkable.

JOHN: He says, but I always kind of thought this might happen and so I have a message for you. I cannot allow you to come walking around on earth like talking to people. He said, it's not something that we, the church or the rulers of the church can allow. And he says, and I'm going to be fair and I'm going to tell you why. He says, do you remember back when you were presented with these temptations by the opposing? Do you remember?

TUCKER: Yes.

JOHN: He says, you see, what he offered to you was the ability to assume responsibility for all of these people to make rocks and to bread and water and to wine. And all you had to do was just make

the deal and you could have then assumed all worldly power in order to just take care of these fools, these humans with all of their flaws and their ignorance and their limitations. You could have just taken care of them, but instead you chose to ask of them to maintain their responsibility and their free will. This was an absurd decision that you made. Humanity is not capable of assuming this burden. You asked too much.

So what we are going to do is we are going to do the deal that you should have taken. We're going to take care of them. We're going to make sure that they're provided for and in return, they shall give us their obedience because it's obedience that we need in order to run this ship properly. So that's why I'm arresting you and that's why you're not going to see the light of day under my watch. So it's a great scene. What do you have to say to that?

So in the scene, the grand inquisitor, Jesus stands up, he walks up to the inquisitor and he kisses him. And it's such a cool scene because this is an old vain, cynical guy. He's just so accustomed to everything going his way. He doesn't believe in anything anymore. But that kind of melts his heart a little bit. And so he leaves the inquisitor, then leaves the cell and leaves it open. So anyway, Ivan says what do you think of my little story? And Elisha then says, it's kind of interesting. Let me think about it for a moment.

I'm happy to see you, brother. I think I have to go. And then Elisha gives Ivan a kiss. And Ivan says, that's plagiarism. Anyway, I love the scene, but why am I getting kind of a model in telling this? There's a reason. I think this is a very plausible explanation. Those who rule this world, there seems to be a perception. There are certain things that are non-negotiable that we just won't accept any resistance. And one of those non-negotiable things is apparently vaccines.

Everybody has to get them. They don't have to question them. He who questions them will be relentlessly persecuted like a heretic.

TUCKER: Is there... You've made the case for that. I believe every word that you have said, I think the last five years stands as testimony to the truth of what you said. But we still are alluding the core question, which is, is there something about vaccines that

makes them really important, the most important thing to the people who run the world? Because it is the world. It's not.

JOHN: It's the world.

TUCKER: It's the whole world. Right. So whatever this thing is about vaccines has been noted for close to 100 years. I mean, Jay Rivera painted that mural. What's interesting about it is a funny picture. I agree and Jay Rivera had very little talent.

JOHN: By the way, I think the Christ child is a self-portrait.

TUCKER: I'm sure that it is and he's a ludicrous figure and got more claim than he deserves. But he was, if nothing else, sort of an indicator of what the people in charge thought. He was their sort of pet muralist. So they understood that 90 years ago that vaccines were at the center of some... What is it about vaccines? Is it the piercing of the skin, the blood? I mean, is it a ritual? I mean, clearly it is, but is there something inherent about the vaccines?

JOHN: I think that the entire edifice of our everything that pertains to public health policy, which includes the ability to invoke a public health emergency, to quarantine people, to put them under house arrest and affect under house arrest. I mean, I remember I went to this March in Washington, D.C. in January of 2020, opposing the vaccine mandates. I wasn't allowed to enter a restaurant in D.C. I couldn't stay in a hotel in D.C. I had to stay in Virginia.

So it's a way, I think, this is just one way of looking at it. If you refuse to get injected... I mean, it's kind of the ultimate... People could say, well, if you come to work, you have to wear a uniform. Or I mean, there are these different sort of restrictions on personal freedom and personal space that we sort of accept is just sort of part of a reasonable set of expectations to participate in institutional life. But getting injected, and you don't know what's in the injection, you don't really know anything about it. I mean, when you go to get your vaccine or your child vaccinated, the package insert isn't presented to you. There is no informed consent. I mean, it's just the pediatrician says, you've got to get this for your kid to attend school.

So here we go. You've free will contemplation of the reality of this. It's just not even in it. You just agree. So I think it's the ultimate form of obedience. I mean, what could be... I mean, well, consider that if

there's a vaccine mandate, we can lock you up. We can shuffle you off to some shitty hotel in Sydney for two weeks. We could prevent you from playing in the tournament. So it's the ultimate method of control.

TUCKER: So it's not... So you're answering the question, I think, by saying it almost doesn't matter what's in the vaccines or not. It's not inherent to the chemical formulation of the product. It's not that mRNA technology, whatever, its effects are, that wasn't necessarily the point. It was the ritual of forcing people to do something against their will without their consent. And once you've done that, you are in control. It's a rape, basically.

JOHN: You are a kind of inverted communion. You have to take the communion or you can't be a part of this congregation.

TUCKER: Well in communion itself, I'll say this is a believing Christian, is not... I mean, right? So Jesus said this is my body and blood shed for you for the influence of sins. Take this in the remembrance of me. The human mind cannot understand what that means. No. But we accept it. We accept it. Right. And then we accept it as a mystery, maybe, or something to that effect, meaning that the fact that you don't understand it is part of the point. Acknowledging that you can't understand it is part of the point, and therein lies its power, right?

JOHN: It has immense symbolic power. And I think that you participate in communion and there is a mystery, there's debates and theological sergeos. It's trans-substantiation or just symbolic. The thing about a vaccine is it's injected into your deltoid muscle and you don't know what it is. Now what was particularly... So it's the ultimate in terms of your physical body. Never mind the symbolic value of this. It's meaning. And I think meaning is perhaps the ultimate thing that we're seeking in this life. But this is a direct injection into your physical body and that of a very small developing child.

So what was really spooky about the COVID-19 vaccine, and remember, there were different iterations of this. There were attenuated vaccines. There were inactivated vaccine sets to say SARS-CoV-2 cultured and then attenuated or inactivated. But what these guys really, really were interested in was this gene, this

genetic product, messenger RNA. And I think this is really important. And we go into this in our book, messenger RNA, the actual molecule was discovered in the 60s in France. And there's something very important about this that I think goes to the absolute heart of scientists, the long-standing dream. It's the myth of Prometheus or Lucifer. And I actually think that Lucifer should be viewed in some ways as a kind of... He's a close stepbrother of Prometheus and some interpretation.

He's a bringer of light. If it weren't for Lucifer, you'd have this dumbass guy and girl sitting around eating mangoes or something. And they'd never awaken to the reality of the world. They would just be stuck kind of... I mean, it sounds kind of nice, just kind of perpetually in love walking around the garden. But the idea of Lucifer is, no, you have a brain. Use it. Explore. Discover. Learn about your limitations. Maybe you can even transcend your limitation. So I think that's the idea of Lucifer, the bringer of light. Now, I'm not saying that Lucifer is a great guy. I'm saying this is, I think, part of this scientific archetype to transcend the limitations of our mortality.

So now you ask, what about these guys in Silicon Valley, the masters of the universe now? I mean, the electronic world that we wouldn't be having this conversation, if it weren't for the great lords of technology and Palo Alto or Menlo Park or whatever. So I think that a lot of those guys, you might say, and I don't say this to criticize them, I just think it's a description, you might say that they're suffering from Luciferian pride. It's pride that I have discovered the way the universe works. I can take electrons and create a picture and send a picture. It's almost like magic. And I actually know a professional electrician, and you can ask him about electricity. And I'll ask him a complex question and he'll say, well, I would characterize that as FM frequency. I was like, well, what do you mean, like frequency modulation? He says, no, that's what we call an electricity fucking magic. There are certain things about our use of electricity that is just remarkable.

TUCKER: But it's opaque even to the people who know about it. So this was actually, and I went and looked this up because I'm very interested in electricity and what exactly it is. And there was a huge

debate in the United States at the time of electrification, not like TVA electrification, but 19th century. Citizen popularizes the light bulb, all of a sudden it's amazing. No more oil lamps. We can stop killing the sperm whales, all this stuff. It's like great.

But there were people in the United States, sane people, and a lot of them are Christian clergy who were asking questions and you can look it up. Like, what is this exactly? And of course, none of them ever got a straightforward answer into this day. No one can really answer that question. What is this exactly? Because no one really knows exactly what it is. I'm not attacking electricity. I'm just noticing. I just find it so interesting that you can base your whole civilization on this thing, but nobody even like a master electrician can explain every part of it. So who's in charge? The reason that's interesting is because if you don't fully understand something, are you really its master?

JOHN: Right. Right. Right. Right.

So, but this idea, yes, we don't. And I think, so I'm going to come back to messenger RNA. But what I want to say about the great Lords of Tech is I recently had the great privilege of meeting one personally. And I really liked him. He was a brilliant man, a stunning intellect. And I've long admired him. It was a confidential meeting, but I have long admired him. I've read his biography. I think he's a miraculous guy. I mean, in terms of intellect.

TUCKER: I suspect I know him.

JOHN: Yep. But what struck me during our conversation in which he couldn't have been more gracious and polite was, and this is my subjective perception. And I was with Dr. McCullough in the meeting. There's nothing we could possibly tell this man that he doesn't already know. He already knows everything. It doesn't matter how much Dr. McCullough has studied and observed and has worked 16-hour days examining all this. This very distinguished, very impressive man, he already knows it.

TUCKER: Okay, now I know who you're talking about.

JOHN: Because they're like one person. I know like this. Yes. He already knows everything. And one of the things he knows is that

vaccines are safe and effective. So again, we're back to these axiomatic things.

TUCKER: And you believed that he sincerely believed that?

JOHN: I think he did. I think he has some interests in believing that. I mean, it's not just, it's probably not just intellectual intrigue that has caused him to believe this.

TUCKER: Can I say one thing about that? It's too simple to say that when people have conflicts like the one you're describing, if in fact that's a real conflict, it's too simple to say it's only about the money. There is a phenomenon that I have lived personally over decades where if you're too close to something and you're benefiting from it and you like it, it sounds about money if you like it, if you like the world you live in, which I did, it's very hard, maybe impossible to see its real character.

JOHN: It's true. You're in it. You're swimming in it.

TUCKER: You know everyone in it and you like them. And it's not just like they're paying you to say nice things about them as you like these people. They can't be part of something. You just, whatever they're part of, you can't fully see it.

JOHN: That's all I'm saying. You can't. And you know, something that has been a matter of great controversy and strife and anger and high emotion that has come up in public discourse recently is the ancient anthropological constant of tribalism. Tribalism. And if you're not a tribalist, if you don't see the world in terms of tribe, then, and I beg your pardon for being academic again, but I think Wittgenstein, the great linguistic philosopher, would have said you don't understand the conversation.

In other words, tribalists, guys who hate each other and are involved in reprisals and this kind of zero sum race to the bottom. Albanian mountain feuds. Yes. Serbs versus Croats. Exactly. Yes. So I was, when sailing down on the Dalmatian coast, pulled into a gas station just north of Dubrovnik to get some gas for my car. And I walked into this gas station and the whole gas station was like a shrine to the villainy of the Serbs. And as a Croatian guy, just north of Dubrovnik.

TUCKER: Really slow, but on Milosevic posters or something?

JOHN: Just, well, okay. To be fair, some lunatic Serbian artillery guy had actually direct hit on his gas station. So okay, all right. I get it back during the Yugoslav war. And why these jerks decide to shell Dubrovnik? It's like, what do you guys, clearly these guys had just completely lost their minds. Why are you shelling Dubrovnik? Why did you, okay, a gas station? Okay, all right.

So just blow the shit out of that gas station. So here we are like 16, no, 26 years later. And the whole gas station is a shrine to Serbian villainy. So can you imagine every day walking in to your place of work and there is everywhere on the wall, a reminder of the injustice that you suffered 26 years ago at the hands of the Serbs. So I just, this was fascinating. I got to talk to this dude. So he spoke broken German, some of the Croatians from the old Austro-Hungarian Empire. They can still speak a bit of German.

And I said, why do you believe that they shelled Dubrovnik? Like that doesn't really make sense. Like what is the strategic value of shelling Dubrovnik? It's just like a World Heritage site, you know? He says, he looks at me, he says, what reason? He says, there is no reason in these monsters. They're insane. They're deranged. They're demonic. There's no reason in, and he's furious. It's like, it's just, can you imagine? I can picture this scene, yes.

So it's hard for me, somebody who's, I don't have a tribal allegiance. I mean, you could say, well I have a kind of sentimental affection for my English ancestors. Right. You know, I think I related to Sir John Leake was, I think he was Queen Anne's admiral during the War of Spanish Secession. So, and there's a book about Sir John. And you know, I've read the book and it's like, well, he sounds like a cool guy. But the trials and travails of his struggle in the War of Spanish Secession. I mean, it's like, who cares? So I can't get into the internal logic of this conversation about this tribe did this and then that and then we're back and forth and who killed more than the other guy.

TUCKER: And would you say it's true that people without a tribal identity are at grave disadvantage against those with a powerful tribal identity because they don't, they don't understand what they're, what they're looking at all.

JOHN: You don't understand what you're looking at. No, I don't understand.

TUCKER: I totally agree. I have exactly the same views. Maybe it's the Episcopal Church taught us this or something.

JOHN: But yes. Well, I remember during, before my grandfather died, he fought in Italy, he slept on the ground for two years and he'd slung it out with, with, with Jerry in Italy. I mean, like hot combat and my, my great uncle, Bobby Waidsall was killed in Italy and it was very traumatic to my, to my great grandmother. But the thing that, so in my great grandmother, by the way, her family was originally from Germany.

So there was this kind of confusion about that. And I remember talking to my grandfather and he said, what are the most disturbing things I remember? He said, we, we, there's a machine gun nest and we kind of were able to maneuver and get close and somebody tossed a grenade into it. And the grenade went off and then the guns fell silent. He said, so then we entered the machine gun nest and the soldier manning it was just a boy. He didn't even have a beard. He was like a 14 year old and he said the Germans were moving all of their manpower to the Eastern Front. Always. Yes. To fight the Russians.

And so they had just pulled back these positions in northern Italy, north of Florence and they're very clever. He said, they kind of set these things up where just a little kid could operate it. He said, and they had these fascinating little, little maps and then you could actually, with a lever, you could identify with binoculars, where are the Americans and then you could move a corresponding lever to put the gun to sight the gun. He said, it's very ingenious. But I remember thinking, this is just friggin awful. Like it's like a little kid.

So, and this was my...

TUCKER: Only the United States would do that though. I think, and this might be wrong, but it's correct-ish. I think in 1941, December when the war started, the largest ethnic group in the United States was German. I think that was the... If you ask people, wait on what's your ancestry. I think German was number one. It was number two after English, but it was right up there. And the whole country, so

what other country, which is fine, I'm very anti-Hitler, okay? But where else in history could you say to a population, go fight your distant relatives in the land of your ancestors and have them go do it, only in a country where tribal identity had been discouraged to the point where it disappeared?

JOHN: Completely.

TUCKER: Completely. And then we'll step in the first World War where millions of Americans of German ancestry changed their last names, called themselves Dutch, the Pennsylvania Dutch, obviously German, but they were so ashamed of their own tribe that they pretended they weren't part of that tribe, and I'm not criticizing it. I'm just saying, I don't think that's ever happened in history.

JOHN: No, no. The American adventure or project has been unbelievably successful until, I don't know, 2000. Yep. So why do I mention war and tribalism and all of this? If you're in the vaccine ideology and you've completely 100% been indoctrinated in it, I can't talk to you. It's like you're in another tribe. And I think that is perhaps the point of the whole thing. Let's divide, let's stamp out vaccine hesitancy, and then those who take the communion, who receive the boy who receives, those who receive it will then be permanently separate from those who are hesitant and refuse.

So it's like you've just created a tribal identity and he who hesitates, he who refuses, well, if he's in Washington, DC, the nation's capital, he can't stay in a hotel. He can't have a steak dinner with Senator Johnson near Capitol Hill because he's not vaccinated.

So I think that's what this is about, but I want to get, we might be running short on time, but I do want to talk about messenger RNA.

So this Promethean or Luciferian intellect and the pride that is taken in that, there's no grander expression of this than messenger RNA.

So the original idea was, well, if you think about messenger RNA, there's a trinity of the way proteins, the building blocks of life or proteins. Okay, so there's replication, which is a DNA strand replicates itself. There's transcription, which is the DNA using RNA, which is one half DNA strand, to send information outside of the cell nucleus into the external part of the cell, the sort of watery part of the

cell, RNA then instructs, that's called transcription, and then translation, that RNA instruction then tells the cell what to do. . And I mean, it's like you're talking about electricity. I mean, if you start studying molecular biology, you think, oh my God, like this is so fascinating. It's so interesting. Like, in Francis Collins, who was the head of the NIH when COVID came, he wrote a book in 2006. Do you remember this book?

TUCKER: Of course not. No, I was not even aware he existed until COVID. And all of this went way under my radar.

JOHN: So Francis Collins wrote a book called *The Language of God*. And what he claimed was with the Human Genome Project, with all the advances that had been made in understanding molecular biology, DNA, RNA, messenger RNA, that scientists were reading the code in which God had created life. So you're probably wondering why I mentioned the Silicon Valley guys. So code, you code things. You enter a code, you transmit the code, and then that initiates an operation. An instruction to do something. And we're headed this way in a big way with artificial intelligence. But the idea is it's like God is a divine coder. And using nucleic acid, he coded up there in the celestial laboratory. He coded life. And now the human intellect has reached a point where we can read the code. Okay, so that's interesting. Okay, so I read the book, God's language. That's cool. I mean, maybe we're reading God's language. I think Einstein said, I want to know God's thoughts. Okay, so far so good. But what these mRNA vaccine guys did, they went one step further. We're not only going to read the language of God. We're going to start writing in the language of God using messenger RNA. We will now use pseudo uradinated messenger RNA to instruct the body to produce the proteins, the building blocks of life that we want it to produce. What could go wrong?

TUCKER: What could go wrong? I think now it's just going to interject in one sentence and remind everyone that Adam and Eve were not expelled from the garden for ignorance. Right.

JOHN: Well, just the opposite. Right.

But now, okay, I'm glad that you raised this because now we come to a point that I think lies at the heart of the human condition. How do

we recognize? So we are curious. I mean, when I was a boy, my mother said your problem is you're so curious. Like, if somebody tells you can't look at something, the first thing you do is look at it. Somebody tells you don't go and onto that piece of property. Well, then next minute, you're climbing over the gate. I mean, it's like, what is it about telling us? You can't look into that.

TUCKER: Yes. Just one piece of fruit you can't have. That's it. Otherwise, you're set. It's like, it's perfect, but you just can't have this one thing.

JOHN: But consider the contradiction of that because to go back to the grand inquisitor by I have been Karen Mazov, it's a paradox because in a way what the grand inquisitor is suggesting is just give us all of your free will. Yes. And we'll take care of you. It's like we're going back to the pre-lapsearian state where you're just taken care of. You don't have to ask any questions. You don't have to try and figure anything out. You're just told the way the world is and you accept and you obey. So this is the tension in being human. And the messenger RNA stuff where the whole thing becomes so fantastically absurd.

And this is another really important point that we try to convey in our book. There's so much these guys don't know. So they get these little glimmers of insight. It's like, holy Toledo, can you believe what we just observed? Where it becomes very childish and very intellectually challenged is the next thought, oh, now we've figured it all out. Now we can assume the helm. That's right. Just on the face of it, that's preposterous. You just figured something out. You just got a glimpse of something. You need to recognize what that's telling you is how much you don't know. You don't know. There's so many things you don't know.

TUCKER: But the irony is that the scientific process, science, is designed as a counterbalance to those very human instincts. I know something there from an expert. That's called hubris. And the process itself is again designed to rein that in to show you how much you don't know. That's the whole thing.

JOHN: So how did that not work? My favorite medical historian is Oliver Wendell Holmes, senior, a very, very interesting guy. And he

once made an observation, which I've thought, God, if you could just frame that, put it on the wall of every library, excuse me, of every laboratory. He said science is the topography of ignorance. Exactly. From a few elevated points, we triangulate vast spaces of unknowns. So that is a person who's actually using his head. He's actually thinking. He's not just saying, oh, look how smart we are. Look, at all of this brilliant stuff that we just discovered, now let's start making a thousand assumptions that are totally unwarranted.

TUCKER: I'm going to ask you one last specific question about messenger RNA. So I think as you said a number of times, we don't really know its effects and we don't know certainly where it's going long term. But the one thing that strikes me, we should be very concerned about, is the possibility that it changes people in a way that they pass on to their children, that it changes their genetic code. Because that's of course destroying humanity as we know it. Is there any indication that that is happening or could happen?

JOHN: Yes. There are a few things that I would say to that. The first highly alarming thing is there is evidence that it actually impairs fertility. So that's perhaps a paradox. It's actually preventing you from passing anything on to your kids because you're not having them. So that's one thing.

TUCKER: There's real evidence of that. Yes. Yes. In the world, is it still legal in the United States to inject people with that?

JOHN: Fertility is just the start of it.

TUCKER: That's all I need to know. That's all I need to know. That's almost enough to make you think, we have to stop this now.

JOHN: For sure. Well, Peter McCullough has been proclaiming this for a while. No, but for real.

TUCKER: We can't have that. Right. Sorry, sorry, sorry. I'm turning my emotions under control. But yes, that's really...

JOHN: I'll tell you something else when you talk about young people, fertility. In July of 2021, the New England Journal of Medicine, to their credit, published a peer-reviewed case study of a young man, an adolescent boy, who developed myocarditis, inflammation of the heart, consider the symbolism of this. A young fit boy develops myocarditis, inflammation of the heart, shortly after

receiving a messenger RNA COVID shot. I actually had dinner with Dr. McCullough that night. He was very alarmed by this. He said, I mean, I've been practicing cardiology for 30 years. I very, very rarely see myocarditis. And this preposterous assertion that, well, it's just a little bit of heart damage. He said, this is ridiculous.

You need your heart to keep beating every second or millisecond for the rest of your days. That poor muscle, you can't afford to damage it. There's no minor damage to your heart. No. No. So he said, this is really a disaster. So what is the reasonable thing to automatically recognize in the summer of 21? It's very simple. We already know we're over a year into this, that young athletes are not at risk of severe COVID illness. It's just, they're just not. It has zero statistical significance as a purported threat to the health of young athletes. And one might, I might add, young athletes are kind of the hope. I mean, they're sort of, not that they're athletes, but that they're young and strong and have full possession of their abilities and faculties. And like, those are the young fellows that are going to perpetuate our civilization. That's our country. That's our country, precisely. So why would you do anything? Why would you take any unnecessary risk that could damage young people? It's, it, okay, you could say in a nursing home, our risk benefit analysis is that take the risk with the vaccine because these people are very frail. If they get, well, we could argue that. Maybe we should have a discussion, but just to say all the young boys and little girls should get this shot, even though they're not at risk of COVID-19.

TUCKER: It's the opposite. It's the most unnatural thing ever because the progression of nature is really simple. You go through phases in life. And at a certain point, that's all you care about. I'm only 56. I already don't care about me at all. And I mean that, not because I'm so selfless. I'm not selfless. But because that's just, it's just natural at a certain point you pivot from worrying about you to worrying about your children and your grandchildren. What comes after you? That's, I mean, that's the life cycle. Animals are this way. This is the most natural thing ever. And when that's subverted, then you know it's from hell.

JOHN: It's true. So it gets, it gets dark.

So doctor gets darker. I don't know if I get a handle. I mean, it, that's dark, but it's about to get darker. So the editor of the New England Journal of Medicine, who's also an adjunct professor at the Harvard Medical School. So in terms of institutional prestige, it doesn't get any more prestigious. I mean, you're talking about number one, public medical professional probably on earth. Professor at Harvard, editor in chief of the New England Journal of Medicine. I mean, that's like the pope.

His name is **Dr. Eric Rubin**. And he was also an advisor on the FDA deliberative committee to decide whether we should approve the messenger RNA COVID-19 vaccine for young people. I think the original decision is people under the age of 18. We have the transcript of the deliberative committee meeting. The question is, should we, should the FDA and I'm the, in effect, he's the most prestigious advisor in the room, should it be approved for young people?

So this is his reasoning. And I just quote the transcript. Okay. So the question is, do we approve this for young people? He says two things. First of all, the risk benefit analysis is different from what it is for older people. And he doesn't need to spell this out. Everybody understands is older people seem to be at greater risk of getting into trouble with the illness itself. So yes, we have a different risk benefit profile when it comes to young people.

That's a euphemism. I mean, there's a big difference in the risk benefit profile. Young people aren't at risk of this at all. And we have something else. We have a signal. And he said, I'm not sure if it's 100% real, but I think that it is. He's referring to myocarditis in young people. So the signal, I believe is real. So you have a bad safety signal. And then you have in terms of the risk of the illness for young people, it's nil. So he said, so it's a tough decision. But I think in the final analysis, we won't really know until we just start giving it.

TUCKER: So Ruben said that. Those are his exact words. So how was he punished for that? That's the orthodoxy. He's so not punished.

JOHN: No.

TUCKER: No, I mean, it's like, how could you show your face after saying something like that? I don't know. It's like someone atop the public health infrastructure in America. How could you? And so there was no shame, professional shame attached to him for that. Well, he wasn't sanctioned by anybody or fired.

JOHN: To be clear, there's still the FDA and the CDC technically acknowledge that an adverse side effect of the COVID-19 vaccine is myocarditis, particularly in adolescent males. Okay. So, but that is so qualified with the assertion, but it's so rare that we needn't really concern ourselves with it. It's a very low risk outcome. So that is the assertion in order to prevent there from being any repercussion. Now, Senator Ron Johnson held a here, a Senate hearing in May of this year. I actually attended with Dr. McCullough. And the question was, has myocarditis been deliberately obscured? The risk has it been covered up by the US government? The same agencies who approved it for young people and the answer is yes. And I think that this is very, very important. There isn't going to be a public acknowledgement from the same group of guys that they've made catastrophic errors in all of this. That will never be admitted. It will never be acknowledged. It won't.

TUCKER: Well, then you have at that point no moral authority, no credibility, and you can't continue in the same way that you did before. Like normal people will say, I'm not listening to a word you say, I'm not going to the doctor. That's where I am personally, but it's not just me. It's like any person who thinks about this. It's like, how could I ever believe you again?

JOHN: Do you remember what I was saying earlier about a large percentage swath of the American people no longer believe anything their government agencies tell them? It's the same.

TUCKER: And mRNA vaccines are still being given to young people. Right now. Yes. So, yes. I don't want to marinate in rage because it's not good for me. And I don't think it doesn't elevate the conversation. But let me just circle back to the original question and just make sure we settle it. Do you think there's evidence that the change is to people to their genetic structure wrought by these vaccines could be passed on to their children?

JOHN: The McCullough Foundation, of which I am the vice president, we just published, I should say, we posted, we did an exposition of a paper that was recently published in which a patient, it's a published paper. It's a published case study. It's not a question of speculation. It's been published. Now, molecular biologists, I'm sure, could debate about this. But the finding is a person who had cancer of the bladder, which is a very severe cancer, in that tumor, so in the bladder cells that had become dysplastic, that the... When cancer begins to develop, remember I was telling you about the coding, you get coding errors and it starts forming these malignant cells, which are chaotic and that don't work, but they keep replicating.

That's the problem with cancer. It's like this dysfunctional thing that just keeps replicating. It's kind of a horror show.

Now I don't pretend to be an oncologist, but the finding is, is that messenger RNA was found in the cancerous cells of this tumor. So it seems to be integrating. Now the question is, is it integrating in a way that can be passed on to the offspring, or is it so dysfunctional that it's killing the host before it can be passed on? I don't know that we yet know that, but remember the science is the topography of ignorance. There's a lot about this that is very, very concerning.

There's also a study that this messenger RNA seems to have transcribed into liver cells. So to really get to the bottom of this, you would have to have molecular biologists who aren't entranced by this. It would have to really be willing to seriously evaluate it without presuppositions, and I just don't know that we're there. That's the problem where we are.

If you receive the vaccine, if you approved it, if you told your patients they need to get it, are you really going to be, unless you have a kind of Damacy in Moment where you're like, okay, I totally screwed all of this up. Like 100%, I'm an idiot, all of my assumptions were wrong, but there aren't very many people with decency or integrity in medicine.

TUCKER: I don't think so.

JOHN: Apparently they're on.

TUCKER: I don't think so. I don't think these are complex concepts at all. They're very human concepts. There's nobody who hasn't screwed it up and learned that his preconceptions were wrong and he's given terrible advice or hurt people unwittingly. There's not one person who's past 14 years old who hasn't had that experience, and it is incumbent on us that's our obligation to admit that. If people with the power of life and death, physicians can admit that, then we need to eliminate the profession. You can't have that. That's the one thing you can't have. Dishonesty, lack of concern for other people, like not acceptable. Where's the AMA?

JOHN: So get a load of this story.

Why did I become interested in this whole story of medicine and doctrine, medicine, medicine, and false orthodoxy? This goes back to when I lived in Vienna. I lived in Vienna for many years as a true crime author. I became interested in...

TUCKER: Sorry, your life's true, which we haven't gotten into, but I would encourage people to look it up. So you started as a German speaking philosopher and you wind up with the true crime author. I just love the course of people's lives. You say...

JOHN: Well, I mean, talk about money. I mean, one... And that the power of money to direct people's attention. So I think I would have liked to have been a philosopher. Two things happen. I didn't like hanging around with academics and be... I mean, I don't mind not being rich, but I didn't like being poor.

TUCKER: Oh, I hosted Fox and Friends Weekend for four years. So I know what it means to have to make certain compromises to pay the bills. So I get it.

JOHN: So I got interested in forensic medicine and I got to be pals with the pathologist, the forensic doctor at the Vienna Institute of Forensic Medicine. And she wanted to get some of her papers published in English and she said I know the basic medical terms, but I don't know how to write in a good, nice, flowing style. This was before all these translate things. So I'll do my basic translation. I'll make sure the medical terminology is correct, but could you put this into a paper that somebody might want to actually read? So I did a few translations for her and I got to be pals with her and I got to

where I was hanging out at the Vienna Institute of Forensic Medicine once every couple of months when I was researching my first book. And I became so fascinated. I even thought about writing a screenplay about this. So there was a professor of anatomy at the University of Vienna Medical School in the 1840s and I'm sorry that his name is suddenly slipping me, but he was an anatomy professor. And every day he took his students to the Institute of Forensic Medicine for anatomy class. And then you do anatomical studies of cadavers. And then from the anatomy class, the students would then go to the obstetrics department of the University of Vienna Medical School. And there the head of obstetrics was a guy named Professor Eichnaz Semmelweis. Okay. So the year is 1848.

TUCKER: A pivotal year on the continent.

JOHN: Right, right. So think about a revolution. It's interesting. So it was a 48. It might have been 46. Anyway, 1846, 47 or 48.

Semmelweis is pals with the professor of anatomy. The professor of anatomy is doing a demonstration, is using a scalpel on a cadaver and then accidentally cuts himself. That injury, that wound, then becomes horribly infected and he dies. He gets sepsis and he dies. Semmelweis starts thinking that's interesting because his, the disease progression with the professor, it reminds me of what these girls in the maternity ward are suffering. It's called child bed fever. Exactly. Could it be, might there be a connection? Now remember, this is before the germ theory of medicine. I think an Italian had proposed it, but it hadn't caught on. So Semmelweis says, could it be that the corruption that is transferred from the cadaver to my friend with the scalpel, that the students, they're coming directly here from anatomy, could it be they're transferring the same corruption from the body to the genital tracks of my girls in the maternity ward? Could it be that if I have them wash their hands with chlorinated lime, it's what grave diggers or undertakers use to cut putrefaction, what'll happen?

So he tells the kids, wash your hands with chlorinated lime before you examine the girls in my maternity ward. So let's test your powers of deductive reasoning. What happened to the incidents of child bed fever and the maternity ward when they started washing their

hands? I'm thinking it fell. It fell. It fell almost to zero from 20% to damn well close to zero.

TUCKER: So Semmelweis says, well, that's it.

JOHN: I mean, let's just have the kids wash their hands. So he publishes his study. He does an analysis of two different maternity wards. He does a nice comparative case series study. What do you think the imminences of Europe, the medical universities, Vienna, Paris, Stockholm, what did they say? How did they greet Semmelweis's seminal study with cheering and tears of gratitude?

TUCKER: Is that what you believe? No, because I know people. They said, that's fish tank cleaner. That's horse tranquilizer. How dare you? And then they went on and see an un-to-denounce him.

JOHN: They said, you're crazy. Yes. You've been infected with a deranged superstition. Everybody knows it's got nothing to do with that. You're just putting stupid ideas into the heads of your young and naive students. Stop it.

So Semmelweis says, no. I'm not going to stop it. I'm going to continue researching this and I'm going to continue publishing this. So this turns into a battle royale in Europe. Okay. Now, interestingly enough, Oliver Wendell Holmes is doing the same at the exact same time. I mean, I don't know. Maybe they heard of each other. He's doing it at Harvard and he Holmes is not getting a bunch of blowback at Harvard, but Semmelweis and Vienna is. Okay.

So how badly this escalates and remember this, it'd be useful to remember given the current climate of things. So the imminences of Europe say, we have to silence this guy. Semmelweis then starts firing back. You guys at this point have reached a moment where you actually know that I'm telling the truth. Like the reality is the evidence has now come in.

It's so strong that you know I'm telling the truth, but you would rather than adopt my protocol of handwashing, you would rather that young moms, young mothers and their infants and maternity wards all over the continent of Europe, you would prefer that they die rather than admit you're wrong.

Wow, man. So you know what the response was to him? You're a dangerous lunatic and we're having a court in Vienna declare you

insane and we're going to put you in the Vienna insane asylum. They admit him.

Is this a true story? This is a true story. His wife says to him, I don't see with all due respect to your husband. I don't see how you can be right when all of these medical imminences are wrong. So she leaves him. No way. He's completely forsaken. He put in a mental asylum or insane asylum. There's actually an insane asylum that still stands in Vienna. It's called the Naran Torm, the tower of fools. It still exists by the way. It's very interesting. Remember the end of Amadeus, the film where Sollieri's being wheeled out?

He's in the Naran Torm. Yes. So I don't think that Sollieri's is in the Naran Torm. I think he's at a facility somewhere out in the Vienna woods. A guard strikes him with something. We don't know if it was a blunt object. We don't know if it was a sharp object. He gets an infection and he dies in an insane asylum. No.

TUCKER: It's a true story. And how long was it until he was posthumously vindicated?

JOHN: I think Robert Koch in Germany in the 1870s vindicated. 1870s? So decades. So consider this. When we talk about you're up against censorship and you're up against the imposition of falsehood and no matter what you say, you're just going to be told to shut up, shut up, shut up. I'm familiar with that, yes. It may be 30 years. Yes, that's right. I mean, we may be all gone before. So I'll give you another example, smoking tobacco. So I know you like to smoke in your younger days and my mother will hold this against me. But when I lived in Europe, I enjoyed an occasional cigarette.

TUCKER: So I should be clear, I've never stopped liking smoking. I love it. But no, I realize it has health effects that are bad.

JOHN: So the question was, in the 1920s and 30s in Germany, is there a link between long-term use of tobacco and carcinoma of the lung, cancer of the lung? And here's where you have to be really particular. So it's not that everyone who smokes is going to get lung cancer, it's not true. But could it be that in some cases, among some of the population, there's an underlying susceptibility and if that susceptibility is activated by years of heavy cigarette smoking, could

end that susceptible population? Could it cause carcinoma of the lung?

There was an epidemiologist in Germany named Fritz Linkett and he did a meta-analysis of all of the data from pathologists to doctors to everybody you could talk to that had ever made any observations on this. And he concluded, yes, not in everybody, but in a statistically significant susceptible part of the population, cigarette smoking causes carcinoma of the lung. So that's 1930.

TUCKER: And what year did the surgeon general's warning appear on camel cigarettes? I think 1964.

JOHN: So that's quite a spread. So Sir Austin Bradford Hill was probably the most famous epidemiologist of all time. We have these Bradford Hill criteria of evaluating causation. So in 1950, he does a landmark study and he concludes, yes, again, not everybody, but in a susceptible population, smoking causes carcinoma of the lung. In spite of his prestige, the tobacco industry, all of its hired gun doctors and the tobacco industry did have hired gun doctors, that was systematically obscured for another 16 years. So when interests are at stake, don't expect acknowledgement of error.

TUCKER: It's all shocking, but as I think the story, the amazing story, just told reminds us we should not be shocked because this is how people are and how always have been. And even if the recognition you receive for telling the truth is posthumous or doesn't come at all, it doesn't matter because it's a virtue in itself to tell the truth. And that's why I'm grateful for the book you wrote with Peter McCullough. And I'm grateful for this conversation, which is like twice as compelling as what I expected. So thank you.

JOHN: Thank you.